

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-6 and 11-26 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-4, 11, 12, 24 and 25 are amended herein. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 11, 12, 24 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Shimada et al (U.S. Pat. No. 5,790,797). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Notwithstanding and solely in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicant amends claims 11, 12, 24 and 25. Support for this amendment can be found at least at page 24 of Applicant's specification as filed. No new matter is added.

Claims 11, 12, 24 and 25 each call for a parent device to be selected in advance from among the devices on the network. The parent device creates a device management table and distributes it to the other devices. Shimada fails to teach or suggest such an arrangement. As such, Shimada cannot anticipate claims 11, 12, 24 and 25.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Natalini (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0095269) in view of Terada (U.S. Pat. No. 6,167,046). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Notwithstanding and solely in

the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicant amends claims 1-4. Support for this amendment can be found at least at page 24 of Applicant's specification as filed. No new matter is added.

Claims 1-4 each call for a parent device to be selected in advance from among the devices on the network. The parent device creates a device management table and distributes it to the other devices. Natalini and Terada both fail to teach or suggest such an arrangement. As such, the combination cannot render claims 1-4 obvious.

Claims 5 and 6 depend from claim 1 and should be in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as set forth above.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimada (U.S. Pat. No. 5,790,797) in view of Natalini (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0095269). Claims 14, 15 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimada (U.S. Pat. No. 5,790,797) in view of Terada (U.S. Pat. No. 6,167,046). These rejections are respectfully traversed. Claims 13-16 depend from claim 11 and should be in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as set forth above.

Claims 7 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Natalini (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0095269) in view of Terada (U.S. Pat. No. 6,167,046) further in view of Vuppula (U.S. Pat. No. 7,331,050). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 7 depends from claim 1. Claim 26 depends from claim 24. Claims 7 and 26 should be in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as set forth above.

Claims 17 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimada (U.S. Pat. No. 5,790,797) in view of Smyers (U.S. Pat. No. 6,430,629). Claims 19, 20 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimada (U.S. Pat. No. 5,790,797) in view of Smyers (U.S. Pat. No. 6,430,629) further in view of Gubbi (U.S. Pat. No. 6,434,113). Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimada (U.S. Pat. No. 5,790,797) in view of Smyers (U.S. Pat. No. 6,430,629) further in view of Gubbi (U.S. Pat. No. 6,434,113) further in view of Moran (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0177448). Claim 23 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimada (U.S. Pat. No. 5,790,797) in view of Smyers (U.S. Pat. No. 6,430,629) further in view of Krzyanowski (U.S. Pat. No. 6,792,323). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 17-23 depend from claim 11 and should be in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as set forth above. It should also be noted that Smyers discloses that a user can instruct the monitor to monitor the states of the VCR 110 and STV 130 every five minutes, and monitor the temperature every 30 minutes by obtaining the temperature from thermometer 140 and to instruct the digital camera 120 to capture a digital image and send it to the storage device every fifteen minutes (see Col. 2 lines 36-56). This roughly corresponds to a technique that allows instructing which device is monitored and which content is monitored by using a user interface (UI).

However, Smyers does not disclose that a parent device selected in advance from among the devices on the network creates a device management table and

distributes it to the other devices. As such, even if Smyers is combined with the remaining references, the combination does not yield the claimed invention.

### **CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 18, 2008

By: /Bryant E. Wade/  
G. Gregory Schivley  
Reg. No. 27,382  
Bryant E. Wade  
Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

GGS/BEW/nrk